

8.0 MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
<i>Mandatory Findings of Significance</i>				
a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

2 a. *Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce*
 3 *the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-*
 4 *sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict*
 5 *the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major*
 6 *periods of California history or prehistory?*

7 The project would have effects on biological and cultural resources, air quality, water quality, land
 8 use, and noise that are potentially significant; however, these would be mitigated by the design of
 9 the project, as presented in Chapter 3, and by the mitigation measures described in this analysis,
 10 which Metromedia has adopted as part of the construction mitigation strategy for the project. The
 11 particular impacts, as well as the project design elements and mitigation measures that would
 12 reduce them below a level of significance, are described in the respective sections of this
 13 environmental assessment. All impacts have been either avoided or reduced to a less-than-
 14 significant level.

8.0 Mandatory Findings of Significance

1 **b.** *Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable?*
2 *("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when*
3 *viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the*
4 *effects of probable future projects)?*

5 Section 15064 of *CEQA Guidelines* provides that when assessing whether a cumulative effect
6 requires preparation of an environmental impact report, the lead agency must consider both
7 whether the cumulative impact is significant and whether the incremental effects of the project are
8 cumulatively considerable. No environmental impact report is required if the project's effects are
9 not cumulatively considerable. The lead agency may determine that a project's contribution would
10 be less than cumulatively considerable when either: the contribution would be rendered less than
11 considerable through mitigation measures, the project would comply with the requirements of a
12 previously approved mitigation program or plan that provides specific requirements that would
13 avoid or substantially lessen the project's effects, or the project's incremental impacts would be *de*
14 *minimus*, i.e., so small that the environmental conditions would be essentially the same regardless
15 of the whether the project is implemented.

16 As discussed in the previous section, the potentially significant impacts that could be caused by the
17 project would be reduced to a less-than-significant level by approaches included in the project
18 design or by mitigation that would be included as part of the project. The resources most likely to
19 be cumulatively affected by the project would be air quality, biology, noise, and traffic and
20 transportation. These are discussed below.

21 Almost all air basins within the state are non-attainment areas for one or more criteria air
22 pollutants. Activities that emit criteria pollutants within those air basins could have a significant
23 cumulative impact on air quality. The air quality management districts and air pollution control
24 districts established under state and federal law to preserve air quality have adopted plans
25 intended to reduce pollutant levels over time. These districts, including the Bay Area Air Quality
26 Management District and the South Coast Air Quality Management District, have established rules
27 and programs under their air quality plans that limit project-specific contributions to the overall
28 problems. As discussed section 7.3, Air Quality, the contributions of the project would not be
29 cumulatively considerable because, as mitigated, the project would comply with applicable air
30 district rules and plans for construction activities and any required permits to operate the back-up
31 generators would be obtained before installation.

32 Biological resources, particularly threatened, endangered, candidate, and other listed species,
33 would not be cumulatively affected by development. The state and federal governments, through
34 CDFG, the Corps, USFWS, and National Marine Fisheries Service, have promulgated a regulatory
35 scheme that limits impacts on these species. The effects of the project are rendered less than
36 cumulatively considerable due to mitigation requiring compliance with all applicable regulations
37 that protect plant, fish, and animal species. The mitigation measures imposed and the provisions
38 included in the project description (e.g., pre-construction surveys and resource staking, presence of
39 an environmental resource coordinator, contractor training) and Metromedia's commitment to re-
40 route the fiber optic conduit around or bore under sensitive resources would render the project's
41 contribution less than cumulatively considerable.

42 At the local level, noise caused by a project could exceed established standards due to the
43 cumulative contributions of activities within the community. As discussed in section 7.11, Noise,

1 the project's contributions to noise would not be cumulatively considerable because either (1) the
2 project would not cause cumulative impacts, or (2) adoption of mitigation measures identified in
3 this document would ensure compliance with state and local noise standards and ordinances and
4 the attenuation of noise due to diesel back-up generators or HVAC systems. These mitigation
5 measures would ensure that noise due to the project would be below established standards.

6 Temporary traffic-related impacts could occur at the local level for the project routes. The
7 temporary traffic disruption resulting from cable installation would not be cumulatively
8 considerable because of the traffic control plans that would be implemented as part of the project
9 and the standard traffic control requirements of the state and local encroachment permits that
10 must be obtained prior to installing cable conduit in or adjacent to roads. In the long term, there
11 would be no project impacts because, upon completion, environmental conditions on the overlying
12 roads would be essentially the same as if the project had not been implemented.

13 *c. Does the project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human*
14 *beings, either directly or indirectly?*

15 The project would not directly or indirectly cause substantial adverse effects on human beings. Air
16 quality would be the only resource through which the project could have a substantial effect on
17 human beings. However, all potential effects of the project on air quality would be mitigated to a
18 less-than-significant level and would therefore avoid causing substantial adverse effects on human
19 beings. The impact analysis indicates that for all other resource areas, the project would either
20 have no significant impacts, or, for impacts that would not affect human beings, less than
21 significant impacts with mitigation incorporation.